

**Amendments to the Drawings**

The attached sheet drawings include changes to Figs. 1-4.

In Fig. 1, one of the reference numerals 105 was changed to 109.

In Fig. 2, reference letter U was changed to reference numeral 103, and the lead line for reference numeral 12 was changed.

In Fig. 3, reference letter U was changed to reference numeral 103.

In Fig. 4, reference letter U was changed to reference numeral 103, reference numerals 2, 3, 4 and their lead lines were added, and the lead line for reference numeral 12 was changed.

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-8 are pending.

Replacement drawing figures are provided herewith. The objections to the drawings are believed to be obviated by the replacement drawings.

An information disclosure statement is provided herewith in response to the Examiner's comments regarding the listing of references in the Specification.


The Examiner's objections to claims 5-8 are believed to be obviated by the amendment to claims 5, 7, and 8 to remove the multiple dependencies.

The rejections under Section 112 are believed to be obviated by the amendments to the claims.

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,929,481 (Alexander).

All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Turning to the rejection under Section 102(b), it initially appears that the Examiner may not fully understand the basic components of an endoscope and, as a result, has mis-interpreted Alexander. Accordingly, to assist the Examiner, a basic drawing of a standard endoscope showing the standard components, such as the control body, angulation controls, insertion tube and umbilical, is appended hereto and reproduced below:




Thus, in the context of an endoscope, it will be appreciated that Alexander discloses an insertion tube (navigation tube 49), a control body (handle 21) and an angulation control (thumb lever 19). Importantly, however, Alexander does not disclose an umbilical, and the Examiner has failed to identify any component of Alexander corresponding to the claimed umbilical.

That is, claim 1 requires an umbilical, yet Alexander does not have any such structure (emphasis added):

1. A dummy instrument for use in a simulator, the instrument comprising: a control body with user manipulatable angulation control, an insertion tube and an umbilical extending from the control body, and at least one angulation cable extending from the user manipulatable angulation control, and down the umbilical, the umbilical being releasably attached to a main unit, a motor within the instrument at a distal end of the umbilical to apply a variable force to the cable, and a position detector within the instrument to detect the angular position of the angulation control.

For the avoidance of doubt, the part 23 of Alexander (see below) is not an umbilical but is rather a secondary tool which is inserted into the control body in order to simulate a secondary device. This tool 23 is inserted into working channel 15 which corresponds to the instrument channel port shown in the drawing of standard endoscope.



In addition to not disclosing an umbilical, Alexander does not disclose an angulation cable, it being noted that claim 1 also requires "at least one angulation cable extending from the user manipulatable angulation control."

The Examiner identifies the belt disposed around the pulleys as being the angulation cable. This is in error for numerous reasons. Firstly, the belt is not a cable. Secondly, it is not a part of the dummy instrument as claimed, but is rather part of the fixture into which the dummy instrument is inserted. Thirdly, it does not extend from the angulation control (handle 21) as claimed but is entirely separate. Finally, it does not extend along the umbilical as this is not present.

Alexander does not disclose numerous key features of the invention and, as such, cannot anticipate claim 1. Likewise, as claim 1 is not anticipated; neither can its dependent claims 2-8.


Accordingly, due to at least the above-noted structural differences between the device of the cited Alexander patent and the structure required by claim 1, withdrawal of the rejections under Section 102(b) is respectfully requested.

Reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowance is requested. In the event this response is not timely filed, Applicants hereby petition for the appropriate extension of time and request that the fee for the extension along with any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper be charged to our **Deposit Account No. 12-2355**.

Respectfully submitted,

LUEDEKA, NEELY & GRAHAM, P.C.

By:

  
Robert O. Fox  
Registration No. 34,165

October 22, 2010  
P. O. Box 1871  
Knoxville, TN 37901  
Phone (865) 546-4305  
Fax (865) 523-4478  
Email: [RFOX@LNG-PATENT.COM](mailto:RFOX@LNG-PATENT.COM)